

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended as set forth above. Claims 27-28, 34-35, and 40-41 are cancelled. No new matter has been added. Applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance

I. Examiner Interview Dated September 14, 2007

An interview was held on September 14, 2007. Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for her time. An agreement as to allowability was not reached. Applicants believe that an agreement was reached that the current changes overcome the cited references.

II. Claim Objection

Misnumbered claim 49 is objected to as being a typo. Misnumbered claim 49 should be claim 39. The claim has been amended as set forth above to remedy the error.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the screen display." Claim 36 has been amended as set forth above to remedy the error.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 22-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0114788 published to Fabritius (hereinafter "Fabritius"). In light of the claim amendments above, applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Independent claim 22 has been amended to include the following combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the cited reference:

providing a display screen having a first orientation, wherein the display screen includes the window;

receiving an indication that the display screen has been changed from the first orientation to a second orientation; and

in response to the indication that the display screen has been changed from the first orientation to the second orientation,

automatically making a first determination of whether the window fits within the display screen,

automatically spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen, wherein spatially adjusting the window includes adjusting the size of the window and adjusting the position of the window,

automatically displaying the window without spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window fits within the display screen,

automatically making a second determination of whether the window fits within the display screen after spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen,

automatically displaying the window without a scroll bar when the window fits within the display after being spatially adjusted when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen, and

automatically displaying the window with a scroll bar when the window does not fit within the display after being spatially adjusted when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen.

The cited reference does not teach or suggest the combination of features of claim 1.

Fabritius teaches as follows:

"FIG. 1b shows a second example of improved portrayal of images on a UI 2 of mobile phone 1 when rotating the orientation of the UI 2. A typical landscape image is to be viewed on the UI 2 of the mobile phone 1 as shown in the left figure of FIG. 1b. Due to the limited width of UI 2, the landscape image is either re-sized to fit the width b of the UI2, as shown in the upper left figure of FIG. 1b, or only a part of the entire image is displayed on the UI 2 by fitting the height of the image to the height of the display and inserting a scroll bar 4, so that the

remaining parts of the right side of the image can be explored by the user of the mobile phone 1 by scrolling (see the lower left figure of FIG. 1b)..." *Fabritius*, at [0005] (emphasis added).

Here, *Fabritius* is teaching two different examples for addressing the problems associated with switching between a landscape and a portrait view. *Fabritius* does not teach the features of claim 1 taking place "automatically" as claimed. Also, *Fabritius* does not teach automatically performing ***both*** the first determination ***and*** the second determine. Stated another way, *Fabritius* does not teach making a first determination to size and position the window and after the first determination is made making a second determination to insert a scroll bar. The dual determination set forth in the claim provides several unforeseen advantages. There may exist times when the window should not be sized and positioned to fit within the screen. For example, there may be a sizing and position point where the window becomes unusable because the data cannot become readily viewed. This may happen with images, text etc. The features of claim 1 allow a window to be sized and position and also insert a scroll bar. As an example, a text box may be sized and positioned. The sizing and positioning may still have the text box larger than the display because to size and position more would corrupt the view of the data. The second determination then inserts a scroll bar so that the data can be scrolled. Such a situation provides optimal use of the display area and window while ensuring that that the user does not receive a corrupted view of the data. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 22 is allowable.

Independent claim 29 has been amended to include the following combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the cited reference:

changing the display screen from a first orientation to a second orientation; and

in response to receiving an indication that the display screen has been changed from the first orientation to the second orientation, ***automatically***

making ***a first determination*** of whether the window fits within the display screen,

spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen, ***wherein spatially***

adjusting the window includes adjusting the size of the window and adjusting the position of the window,

displaying the window without spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window fits within the display screen,

making a second determination of whether the window fits within the display screen after spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen,

displaying the window without a scroll bar when the window fits within the display after being spatially adjusted when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen, and

displaying the window with a scroll bar when the window does not fit within the display after being spatially adjusted when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display screen.

The cited reference does not teach or suggest the combination of features of claim 29. Fabritius is teaching two different examples for addressing the problems associated with switching between a landscape and a portrait view. Fabritius does not teach the features of claim 29 taking place "automatically" as claimed. Also, Fabritius does not teach automatically performing *both* the first determination *and* the second determine. Stated another way, Fabritius does not teach making a first determination to size and position the window and after the first determination is made making a second determination to insert a scroll bar. The dual determination set forth in the claim provides several unforeseen advantages. There may exist times when the window should not be sized and positioned to fit within the screen. For example, there may be a sizing and position point where the window becomes unusable because the data cannot become readily viewed. This may happen with images, text etc. The features of claim 29 allow a window to be sized and position and also insert a scroll bar. As an example, a text box may be sized and positioned. The sizing and positioning may still have the text box larger than the display because to size and position more would corrupt the view of the data. The second determination then inserts a scroll bar so that the data can be scrolled. Such a situation provides optimal use of the display area and window while ensuring that that the user does not receive a

corrupted view of the data. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 29 is allowable.

Independent claim 36 has been amended to include the following combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the cited reference:

a processor;

a display for displaying a window on a mobile computing device, wherein the display is movable from a first orientation to a second orientation; and

a memory having computer executable instructions stored thereon, wherein the computer executable instructions are configured to:

receive an indication that the display has been moved from the first orientation to the second orientation,

in response to receiving the indication that the display has been changed from the first orientation to the second orientation, automatically

make a first determination of whether the window fits within the display,

spatially adjust the window when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display, wherein spatially adjusting the window includes adjusting the size of the window and adjusting the position of the window,

display the window without spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window fits within the display,

make a second determination of whether the window fits within the display after spatially adjusting the window when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display,

display the window without a scroll bar when the window fits within the display after being spatially adjusted when the first determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display, and

display the window with a scroll bar when the window does not fit within the display after being spatially adjusted when the first

determination indicates that the window does not fit within the display.

The cited reference does not teach or suggest the combination of features of claim 36. Fabritius is teaching two different examples for addressing the problems associated with switching between a landscape and a portrait view. Fabritius does not teach the features of claim 36 taking place "automatically" as claimed. Also, Fabritius does not teach automatically performing ***both*** the first determination ***and*** the second determine. Stated another way, Fabritius does not teach making a first determination to size and position the window and after the first determination is made making a second determination to insert a scroll bar. The dual determination set forth in the claim provides several unforeseen advantages. There may exist times when the window should not be sized and positioned to fit within the screen. For example, there may be a sizing and position point where the window becomes unusable because the data cannot become readily viewed. This may happen with images, text etc. The features of claim 29 allow a window to be sized and position and also insert a scroll bar. As an example, a text box may be sized and positioned. The sizing and positioning may still have the text box larger than the display because to size and position more would corrupt the view of the data. The second determination then inserts a scroll bar so that the data can be scrolled. Such a situation provides optimal use of the display area and window while ensuring that that the user does not receive a corrupted view of the data. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 36 is allowable.

V. Request for Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

App. No. 10/773,598
Amendment Dated: September 27, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of July 27, 2007

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Ryan T. Grace

Registration No. 52,956

Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P. O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

206.342.6200

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE